

House of Commons Debates

FIRST SESSION—TENTH PARLIAMENT

7

SPEECH

OF

MR. A. E. KEMP, M.P.

ON

Provincial Government in the Northwest

OTTAWA, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 26, 1915.

Mr. A. E. KEMP (East Toronto). Mr. Speaker, in continuing this debate I feel somewhat relieved when I realize that I am not a member of the legal profession, and therefore I shall not be expected to give any legal opinion in respect to the constitutional aspect of this question relating to the autonomy of the Northwest Territories. I intend to deal more particularly, and briefly, with that portion of this Bill having reference to educational matters; and the stand which I intend to take is that there is no practical difference between the original clause dealing with the educational question and the amendment thereto, of which notice has been given in this House; that, in substance and in principle, they are practically the same. I say that I do not intend to deal with the constitutional aspect of these clauses, because I intend to rest my position upon the argument put forward in this House by the leader of the opposition, a gentleman in whom, I think, we all have confidence, and especially do we have confidence in his legal opinions; therefore, I feel satisfied to rest my case in respect to this feature of the Bill upon his judgment. Sir, my premises will be that this parliament is not called upon to make what I believe to be an amendment to the constitution by forcing these educational clauses upon these provinces, and in that respect creating a constitution for them. I say that this parliament is not called upon to legislate in this manner, and that it is pursuing an unconstitutional course in doing so.

In discussing this Bill, many questions have been introduced which have no bearing upon the issues before us. The Quebec situ-

ation has been more than once, more than twice, more than a hundred times, referred to and dwelt upon by members of this House, sometimes in order, and sometimes out of order, I think. In dealing briefly with this matter, I would refer in passing to the speech of the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), a speech which I could not but regard as inflammatory and as one which does not correctly represent the views of the people whose cause the hon. gentleman professed to champion. I do not find in the speech of the hon. member for Labelle one generous word with respect to those who differ with him on this question: I cannot discover that he exercised any restraint in the sentiments he put forth, though they differed very much from the sentiments of a majority of his colleagues from the province of Quebec. While he was speaking, I felt that the cause of those on whose behalf he spoke was not safe in his hands. His course was a heedless course, an extreme course, and one which I am certain will be barren of good results. In discussing this question both the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) and the Solicitor General (Mr. Lemieux) referred to events in this country over a hundred years ago, they referred to what happened in the year 1774 and also in 1812. I am not referring to this matter for the purpose of criticising the utterances of those hon. gentlemen, but for the purpose of agreeing with a great deal of what they said. I do not see, however, that this part of the speeches of those hon. gentlemen had any bearing upon the issues now before us. My only reason for referring to the matter at

all, is that these hon. gentlemen brought it forward in the course of this debate. They reminded the House of what happened during the war of the American revolution, how emissaries came to this country from the revolted Protestant colonies to the south. These emissaries came to the French Canadian priests and the French Canadian people and invited Canadians to throw in their lot with the revolution. These hon. gentlemen reminded us how both the French Canadian priests and the French Canadian people scorned the advances made to them in 1774 to join a rebellion against Great Britain and in 1812 to give sympathy and aid to those who were at war with Great Britain. These people decided to remain British citizens and they were loyal and sincere in the stand they took. I agree with all that and I am proud of the stand taken by the French Canadians on those occasions as are these hon. gentlemen themselves. But I should have been glad had these hon. gentlemen gone further and explained—in order that we might understand the point that they were making—what other position these people could have taken. Had they pursued any other course than the one they did, they would have lost British citizenship, and that they did not want to do. They preferred to be British citizens rather than become citizens of a country in which they could not have maintained the privileges guaranteed by the settlement of 1759. I would like to have had these hon. gentlemen go a little further, and explain to me what object the French Canadians of those days could have had in joining the United States. These hon. gentlemen are protesting against the establishment here of the kind of schools such as they have in the United States. Had the French Canadians joined the United States, would not that race by this time have become assimilated with the Americans? Would not those who joined the United States and their offspring have been educated in the public schools which were spoken of in such a disparaging way by the Prime Minister? Considering these things, I cannot see what point these hon. gentlemen sought to make in referring to these old events in their speeches in this debate.

A good deal has been said about the Quebec minority; and I also propose to deal with that matter, as coming from the province of Ontario. I wish to deal with it in a way that will not be offensive, I am sure, to my fellow-countrymen in that province. I do not propose to criticise the Quebec educational system. In that province, the public school system, which is Catholic, appears to suit our fellow-countrymen of French origin. These schools have been instrumental in preserving the French language, and in keeping the religious observations of the church uppermost in the minds of the people. The schools are practically a part of the church.

And through the devotion of the clergy to the object in view, there is in Quebec a devout people, who have a great reverence for the Christian religion, as it has been taught to them. And I believe that nowhere in Canada does there exist a better living people than the people of the province of Quebec. So far as the Catholics of that province are concerned education is a union of church and state—such a close union as it is not possible to achieve in any other part of Canada.

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) referred at some length to the situation in the province of Quebec. He was well informed on the subject because he not only represents that province as a minister of the Crown, but he has lived in that province probably all his life. But I think, Sir, that the Minister of Agriculture was most unfair in the way he handled this question and in the charges he made against members on this side of the House and against the Conservative Party throughout the country. Standing in the place and speaking as a representative of the Crown, in which capacity he has charge of an important department of our affairs in every province of the Dominion from the Atlantic to the Pacific, he made the charge that the Conservatives were endeavouring at the present time to do away with separate schools in every province of this country. Here is what this hon. gentleman said:

We find the Tories now wedded to the idea of the right of the majority, the absolute right of that majority, which they say demands that in Canada there shall be no separate schools, and that the Catholic people of this country shall not be given consideration for their cherished principles and cherished feelings. Sir, I do not wonder at this.

Now, Sir, what authority had the Minister of Agriculture to make such a statement in this House, a statement that will be sent broadcast throughout the country? What he has said is utterly without foundation. There has been no attempt in this House, nor have I heard of any movement in this country which would justify any one in coming to the conclusion that we desire to do away with separate schools in Canada. I would like to have the minister furnish even one particle of truth to substantiate this statement. Are the members of the Conservative party trying to do away with separate schools in Ontario or in Quebec where the separate schools are guaranteed under the constitution? Or are they trying to do away with separate schools in any other province? Not a bit of it, and I regret that a minister of the Crown charged with the great responsibilities that the hon. Minister of Agriculture is charged with should have made such a statement and that it should have been spread broadcast in the way it has been over this country.

In discussing this question, as I have said, the situation in the province of Que-

bec has been brought into the debate on many occasions. The situation in the province of Quebec is unique. It is entirely different from the situation in any other province in this country. We have, in the province of Quebec, an almost solid French Canadian population which is Catholic and there is no mixture of Protestants and Catholics in the greater portion of that province. There is a mixture of Protestants and Catholics in the Eastern townships, but, so far as the great majority of the people are concerned, there is a solid Catholic and French population, and it is very easy in that province to regulate these matters. In making comparisons and in illustrating the situation I do not see how we can compare the situation in the province of Quebec with the situation which will exist and which does exist in the Northwest Territories or in any other province in this country.

I regret that this question has been brought into the arena of federal politics again. I regret that some means have not been taken of overcoming the difficulty in some other manner. We have before us the example of Manitoba. We know what happened in Manitoba only a few years ago and did not that illustration show us how impossible it was for this parliament to legislate with respect to this question without creating the greatest amount of friction and without leading to the debate and the agitation that we are experiencing in this country? Would it not have been better that the matter should have been left to the provinces the same as it was left to the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island and could we not reasonably hope that our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens would have fared better if the question had been dealt with in that way? The hon. Minister of Agriculture, in the course of his speech, said that he had no fear for the minority in the province of Quebec and I agree with him entirely in respect to that. I have no fear for the minority in the province of Quebec. I have no fear that any privileges or rights in respect to education which they enjoy at the present time will be withdrawn from them, and that is not because, in the British North America Act, there are certain references to the question of education in Ontario and Quebec. It is because the people of the province of Quebec are dealing with the question in a reasonable and sensible manner. It is because the government of Quebec knows better how to deal with that question than this federal parliament. But, what would be the position supposing the minority in the province of Quebec were interfered with? How would the children of the minority be educated? How could they be educated? I will take this question up for a moment in order to reason it out with my fellow-countrymen in the province of

Quebec whose views perhaps differ from mine, yet whose views I respect, and to point out the different position that exists in the province of Quebec from that which exists in other portions of Canada. In the province of Quebec the schools which are Catholic and which are suitable to the conditions which exist there are religious schools. I have here some extracts from the regulations of the governing committee of the council of public instruction of that province, and I will read one or two of them.

Religious instruction is the most important of the subjects of the course of study, and it shall be taught in every school. In answering questions in the catechism, pupils shall give the exact words of the book, in sacred history lessons this is not necessary. The teacher shall follow the advice of the curé in all that concerns the moral and religious conduct of the pupils.

Elsewhere in the same set of rules we read:

Religion shall hold the first place among the subjects of the course of study and it shall be taught in all the schools.

I want to say again that I have no word of criticism to offer with respect to the regulations of the council of public instruction in the province of Quebec. I am not citing them for the purpose of criticising them, but I am citing them, because, in the discussion that has taken place, the position of the minority has been referred to so frequently and the question which I ask is: What would the minority do if the privileges which they now enjoy were taken away from them? How could their privileges be taken away from them? If their privileges were taken away from them how could their children be educated? Could we expect the children of the minority to go to schools regulated by the regulations which I have just read? No one would expect that, no government in Quebec would legislate in any such way, and neither would this parliament in any shape or form attempt to interfere with the privileges of the minority in Quebec. Why, Sir, it would be just as unreasonable to interfere with the privileges of the minority in Quebec, to take away those privileges and force the children of the minority into the Catholic schools as it would be for the province of Ontario to attempt to enact a law forcing Catholic children to go to Presbyterian Sunday schools. One would be just as ridiculous as the other.

We have heard a good deal of boasting in the speeches of the hon. Minister of Agriculture and the hon. Minister of Finance in reference to the great majority that is going to be rolled up when this Bill comes to the vote. I had no doubt at all when I heard the hon. Minister of Finance announce the great majority that would be rolled up, and when I heard him

4

tell how the party were united that there would be a great majority. I look forward to a great majority. The government have made this a party issue. They have required all their supporters to come to their assistance.

An hon. MEMBER. We got some of yours.

Mr. KEMP. But, the majority which they will roll up on this question will not be the majority which was elected to vote on this question or to deal with it in any shape or form. The government have a large majority and they will gain a few from this side of the House who may see eye to eye with them on this question, but the government were not elected on this issue, this issue was not before the country in the recent elections; in fact no hint was given to the electors that such a grave issue should be raised in the event of this administration being returned to power, and it cannot be said that these hon. gentlemen who are voting represent in every case the views of their constituents. The hon. Minister of Agriculture, in the course of his remarks, seemed to indicate that there was no honesty of purpose in the agitation which exists in regard to this question. He seemed to think there was no honesty of purpose in the west in the agitation which is going on. He was not generous enough to credit any one who differed from him on this subject with sincerity. He did not seem to be of the opinion that any one else had a right to express a different opinion from him. It seemed to me that the hon. Minister of Agriculture did to some extent play the role of the tyrant in the attitude which he displayed when he discussed this question, but I beg to assure the hon. Minister of Agriculture and other hon. members of this House that the end is not yet, and that they will have cause to feel that they have made a mistake in the course which they have taken.

I have already referred to the attitude which the hon. Minister of Finance took when he discussed this question and when it seemed to me he made the most illogical speech that I had ever heard him make. It seemed to me that when an hon. gentleman like himself would take an exactly different position from that which he took in 1896 he was most illogical in the conclusions which he came to and in the statements which he made. Mr. Speaker, it is only nine years since we had an agitation similar to the present one in this country, since we had a question similar to this question which is now before us. It is still fresh in the minds of every hon. member of this House, and it did seem to me that if there was any reasonable excuse that the government could have found for dealing with this question in any other way, for instance, by leaving it to the provinces instead of dealing with it them-

selves, or if they could have adopted any other possible means, they should have done so, and I must confess that I was dumbfounded with the lack of seriousness with which the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) tossed this vexed question into the arena of federal politics having in view what happened only nine years ago. The right hon. gentleman was fresh from the country. He had come back from the country with a large majority and it did seem to me, that, notwithstanding the fact that a large section of the people of this country were agitated in 1896 over practically the same issue, he must have thought he was invincible and that he could lead the people and bring them to his views on the or any other question. Did the right hon. gentleman think that the agitation which took place on this same question in 1896 was simply a joke, and did he welcome another agitation of the same kind? Did he think it was a good thing for us to wrangle in this House for weeks and months on a question of this kind? Were there no important issues which would have for their object to promote the prosperity and happiness of the people of this country? I say I regret the manner in which this question was introduced, and I can see no reasonable excuse for its being so introduced.

A good deal has been said about the agitation which is at present going on in various parts of the country, and especially in the province from which I come. A good deal of surprise has been expressed that there should be any agitation, and some members of this House have gone so far as to say that there is no particular feeling or sentiment on the question in Ontario beyond certain areas and certain individuals. Now, an expression has been used in this debate which is very appropriate, namely, the opinion of the man on the street; I think that phrase was introduced by the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), and I say that the man on the street looks upon this question which we are discussing here to-day in precisely the same light as the question which was discussed in 1896 was looked upon at that time—as a vexed question which should be kept out of Dominion politics, if possible. I am going to point out why the public are aroused in the province of Ontario and why they are justified in the stand they take. Some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have tried to minimize that agitation and to show that there is no public feeling on the subject; but I believe I shall better be able to retain the respect of my fellow members from other provinces by stating the exact position of the case rather than by attempting to minimize the facts. In 1895 the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) stumped in the province of Ontario on the Manitoba issue. The Remedial Bill was referred to,

but the discussion at that time resolved itself into one on the principle of separate schools in the province of Manitoba. The hon. member for Brandon came into federal politics and became a cabinet minister upon that question and upon no other. His views were known to the public and to his colleagues, and he took strong ground upon the question in the various speeches he made. The people of the province of Ontario believed at that time that the premier shared the views expressed by him in the county of Haldimand and other places where he spoke. The people of the province of Ontario and the people of other parts of this country—and I am borne out in this statement by what the ex-Minister of the Interior said in this House a few days ago—believed that the present Prime Minister prevented separate schools as they existed from being forced on Manitoba in 1896; they believed that he was the champion of those who were against separate schools in Manitoba. The ex-Minister of the Interior said in his speech that the Prime Minister stood in the way of those who wanted to force separate schools on that province in 1896. In the course of one of his speeches in Haldimand in 1897—and this sentiment will be found running through many of his speeches—the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) said:

We have a very large territory; our country is a country of magnificent distances; we have unfortunately pursued a policy in regard to land, and I am not here to discuss or criticise that at the present time, but there is a good deal of land that is not occupied by actual settlers, and the people are not as close together as they should be for the purposes of social life. The country is sparsely settled as a rule. When you get out into the country which is sparsely settled, there is the difficulty of getting enough families together to form a school district. In order to make the system efficient, we have settled the policy that we should not have the school district more than four or five miles square. Supposing that you find in a sparsely settled district enough families to make a school, with eight or ten children able to go to that school, and suppose three or four are Roman Catholics, under the old system they were exempt from taxation, they would have nothing to do with the formation of a public school district, and the result was that in many of these places, although there were enough people, Protestant and Catholic, the result of the division of the people was that you could not get a school district.

That was the position the hon. member for Brandon took before the people of this country in 1895 and 1896. The same principle is involved in the present discussion with respect to the sparsely settled districts of the Northwest; and I think I shall be able a little later on to show the inconsistency of the hon. member in the position he has taken on this question. This statement of the hon. member for Brandon was a proof that the Prime Minister was in entire sympathy with the doctrine he then laid down

because he was taken into the Prime Minister's cabinet and no effort has since been attempted to force separate schools upon Manitoba. But, Sir, there were other incidents to prove the same thing. I can remember the occasion of a great public meeting in Toronto, on February 24, 1896. It was open to any one who might wish to attend for the purpose of discussing the Manitoba school issue. It was a non-partisan meeting. The chair was occupied by our late lamented friend Mr. E. F. Clarke, the late member for Centre Toronto. There were both Conservatives and Liberals present. Mr. Dalton McCarthy received an invitation to attend, and did attend; Mr. Joseph Martin received an invitation, and did attend. The present Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) received an invitation and attended the meeting, and on rising to speak he told the people that he had come there after discussing the matter with his leader, Mr. Laurier. Mr. Dalton McCarthy, on rising to speak, said:

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I do not know very well how I am to introduce myself to you this evening for, unlike my friend, Mr. Mulock, I had not any leader to consult before I came before you.

The present Postmaster General then took a position directly opposite to the position which he now takes on this question, and that is one of the reasons why the people of Ontario are aroused on this question. The present Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock), on that occasion moved this resolution

Resolved, that the jurisdiction of the Dominion parliament in educational matters is exceptional, and while we may be united as to whether such jurisdiction ought to exist, we are absolutely unanimous that it is not to be resorted to except in cases of clearly proven abuse of the power of the majority in any province, and after all other efforts to remedy the grievances have been exhausted.

Speaking to that resolution he said:

If then, Sir, in all the maritime provinces this question has been capable of adjustment by the people concerned, are we not warranted in believing that equally happy results will follow if we allow the people of Manitoba themselves to come together, as the resolution from which I have quoted indicate they are willing to do in a friendly conference, with a view of removing every grievance.

He was referring in his speech to the people of Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. He was referring to the old provinces of Upper and Lower Canada.

So divided did the people become over educational and other cognate matters, that government became an impossibility, and at last the great men of that day, regardless of their views, united to devise a scheme that would regulate educational and other matters of a kindred character to the local legislature rather than to the arbitrament on each occasion of

the representatives of the whole people of Canada, and no one subject was with greater unanimity regarded as peculiarly proper to be dealt with by the provinces affected rather than the Dominion parliament, than was the subject of education.

In 1896 the Postmaster General laid it down as a doctrine in the speech to which I have referred that the question of education could more properly be dealt with by the provinces than by the Dominion parliament. He expressed the view which I have expressed that at all times if it is possible to keep this question of education in the different provinces out of the arena of federal politics it should be kept out of that arena. If the Postmaster General or the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), or the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) who expressed exactly the same views in Nova Scotia in 1896 as this hon. gentleman expressed in Ontario, or the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) will rise in this House and say that the public had no warrant for coming to the conclusion they did in 1896 in respect to the position taken by the Prime Minister and his colleagues, then I say the campaign carried on in 1895 and 1896 was the most deceptive political campaign ever carried on in this country. The fact of the matter is that the people had it perfectly fixed in their minds that the Liberal party from the premier down were against the principle of separate schools. If when the present administration came into power that party was known to a large section of Canada as standing for or against any one principle, it was known as standing against the principle of separate schools in the west. The reason why public opinion is aroused is because the people feel that they have been deceived in regard to the attitude that this government has taken upon this question; they are dissatisfied and they are disappointed with the remarks made by the Prime Minister when he introduced the Bill into this House. In his speech in moving the second reading of the Bill the Prime Minister referred to the press of the leader of the opposition and the agitation which this press was making for the purpose of stirring up strife and discord in this country. I would like to ask the Prime Minister what section of the press of the leader of the opposition is responsible for this agitation? Where is the Toronto 'Globe' on this question? Is there any paper in this country with greater influence in the Liberal party than the Toronto 'Globe'? Is not the position of the Toronto 'Globe' on this question as nearly as possible similar to the position which the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) has taken? And has the 'Globe' not expressed itself on different occasions as being very much opposed to the educational clauses of this Bill? Is the 'Globe' not in favour of committing them altogether? But how could

the 'Globe' take any other position than that which it has taken? How could hon. gentlemen expect the 'Globe' to take any other position? What was the position it took in 1896. Was it then not in favour of leaving the question of separate schools in Manitoba to be dealt with by that province? If hon. gentlemen will look through the files of the 'Globe' all through the agitation of 1895-96 they will see that the position of the 'Globe' at that time was in harmony with the position of the 'Globe' in 1905. I am not here for the purpose of defending the course of any particular newspaper, but a good deal has been said about another newspaper in Toronto and the gentleman who edits that paper. That gentleman edited the Toronto 'Globe' in 1896 and could the gentleman who edited that paper at that time take a different position in 1905 than that which the 'Globe' took in 1896? It may be possible that hon. gentlemen opposite may think it necessary to change around, right about face on this question, but they must not always expect every other person and newspaper to follow their lead in matters of this kind. It is interesting to analyse this question and to find out who it is who are agitating, and who are interested in the discussion of this question and whose views differ from those of the government upon it. I think as good an illustration as I can bring to the attention of the House is a protest which came from the city of Toronto a short time ago in the shape of a resolution which was passed at a public meeting. I wish to say that the protest and the agitation and the bigots and the fanatics so called by hon. gentlemen opposite are members of the Liberal party in the province of Ontario. On March 20th, 1905, a meeting was called in the city of Toronto, a public meeting of citizens for the purpose of considering the very question we are now discussing in this House. We do not find that Conservatives were invited to attend that meeting and take part in it. We find that at that meeting a letter written by Mr. Goldwin Smith was read. I shall read that letter to the House.

Though I cannot be with you personally, at the meeting on the school question, my hearty sympathy is with you. A great question, vital to our constitution and our civilization, has been thrust upon us. Let it be clearly and unequivocally settled. If the party politicians will not do this for us, let it be done by the people.

I intend a little later on to say something about the so-called blatant mob in Toronto. I do not suppose any hon. gentleman opposite will accuse Goldwin Smith of being a part of a blatant mob or a bigot or a fanatic. Mr. Goldwin Smith is a personal friend of the Prime Minister's and a gentleman who walked hand in hand with him in the commercial union days.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. And you believe in it and they do not.

Mr. KEMP. Yes, a gentleman who has always supported this government and its policy. Then there was another gentleman who could not be present at that meeting, but I shall not detain the House by reading a letter which he sent to the meeting. That gentleman was the mayor of Toronto, the gentleman who ran in opposition to the present member for North Toronto in the last federal election, a Liberal through and through. He felt called upon to protest and did protest and his letter will be found in the published report of that meeting in the press. Then the next gentleman whose name I saw was Mr. Stapleton Caldecott, who is a Grit of the Grits. His name was before the public in the last provincial election as Liberal candidate for North Toronto. He came to the meeting which I called Mr. Blain, and explained that it was only because his doctor said he was in too poor health that he did not accept the nomination. Mr. Caldecott is so strong a Grit that I have never in my experience ventured to discuss politics with him. He is altogether too decided in his opinions. Well, he spoke at that meeting and his sentiments were in accord with those of the other speakers. The next gentleman who spoke was Mr. J. S. Willison, formerly editor of the 'Globe,'—the gentleman who wrote the biography of the right hon. the First Minister. And no more warmer friend or greater admirer of the right hon. gentleman exists than Mr. Willison. Mr. Willison spoke next to the same effect as the others. Then I find that the next speaker was Dr. Goggin. In the course of his remarks, Dr. Goggin said:

I take it that we meet here to-night as a body of Liberals, intent upon setting before our party our views on this subject, whether they be right or wrong. This I believe is one of the qualifications of a good party man. We are not here as a body of Conservatives intent upon making capital for ourselves. We are not here as a body of Orangemen trying to arrest Romanism. We are not here as representatives of the various churches to protest against the action of our brothers in the Roman communion. But we are meeting here simply and solely as citizens of the city of Toronto, with patriotic interest in the welfare of our fair Dominion.

Then I come to the next gentleman who took an active part in that meeting, and whom I find described in this report as Dalton McCarthy's nephew. I presume the reason he was thus described is the high regard which the people of Toronto have for the late Dalton McCarthy and his great attainments. I need not read what his nephew said, because his views are well known to the House. The next gentleman who spoke was Mr. D. E. Thompson, K.C.—I cannot remember of any one political campaign in Toronto in which Mr. Thompson

did not take an active or prominent part as an advocate of the Liberal cause. I do not suppose that in all his career he ever cast a Conservative vote. He is one of the ablest lawyers in the city of Toronto; and unless he were thoroughly convinced of the soundness of his opinions, he would not have attended that meeting. In the course of his remarks, Mr. Thompson said:

The Laurier government came into power on the Manitoba school question. The question of autonomy had been before them four years and they knew what they were doing. What I want to know is why, if they were going to take this serious step in reference to education, the electorate was not taken into their confidence.

Three other gentlemen addressed that meeting, who are clergymen. I do not propose to judge of what type of politics these gentlemen are. In my opinion a clergyman should have no politics, or at least he should not express himself openly on questions of a party character except on a very rare and special occasion. The three clergymen who spoke were the Rev. Dr. Milligan, the Rev. Canon Cody and the Rev. Dr. Potts. I do not know what are the politics of any of these gentlemen, but I know that Dr. Milligan was a great personal admirer of the Hon. G. W. Ross, I know that Mr. Ross attended his church, and I do not think he had anything to complain of very often regarding the actions of this government. Dr. Milligan said:

Concerning the deliverance from Ottawa a month ago, the reverend speaker said it came like a thunder clap from a clear sky, considering the attitude of the Liberals in 1896.

The Rev. Canon Cody said:

A simple solution would be the best and the obvious one is to keep this tangled question out of Dominion politics and leave it to the provinces to solve.

The Rev. Dr. Potts thus expressed himself:

If Paul could say he was a Hebrew of the Hebrews, Stapleton Caldecott could say he was a Grit of the Grits. When I open the 'Globe,' as I do every morning—and in order that I may not be injured I read two Conservative papers—and see the noble stand it is making on this question, I am beginning to realize that country is more than party.

Now, I have taken up a little time in laying before this House the foundation of the agitation in the province of Ontario and the position which intelligent men take on this question. I regret exceedingly that it has been found necessary by some hon. gentlemen, in the course of this debate, to call names and to charge the people of Ontario with being bigots. I do not think that any hon. gentleman in this House will say that these gentlemen who spoke at this meeting are bigots or Tory fanatics or anything of that kind, and I regret that some hon. members have found it necessary to resort to

that style of argument. So far as I am concerned, I want to repudiate the charge of bigotry directed against the people of Ontario. A large number of the people of that province sincerely believe that the educational policy of the government in respect to the two Bills under consideration is opposed to the best interests of the west. They are firmly convinced that it will be a great injury to that country to saddle it with a dual system of schools. It may be that the ideals which a section of the people of Ontario wish to attain in respect of this question are unattainable. But whether they be unattainable or not, let us discuss these things in a reasonable way. Let us not say that the people of the province from which I come are seeking to raise a racial issue. Such is not the case, and I defy any one to bring a tittle of proof to substantiate any such charge.

Before this Bill was introduced, I had received a great many letters, chiefly from my constituents, with reference to this question, and also I received a large number after this Bill was brought down. I have selected two letters from the bunch in my desk, and I propose to read one of them and an extract from the other, and what I do not read in the other has no reference to the subject we are discussing. My object in doing this is to show what is in the mind of the ordinary voter—not the ordinary professor in a university or college or the ordinary lawyer or business man, but the ordinary man on the street; and I must say that the greater number of the letters I have received come from workingmen and mechanics. The gentleman who wrote me the letter I am about to read, wrote it on the 20th February, before the First Minister introduced his Bill. And I want to say that I have selected two letters from Orangemen. I think our friends from another province may have an exaggerated idea what an Orangeman is. I do not know as much about the Orange Order as I might hope and I wish I knew more, but what I do know about it is nothing but good. I do not know anything in regard to them different from that. This gentleman in writing to me, says:

The Orange association does not look upon this question in a spirit of narrow bigotry, but takes the broad view that in a country like ours we should endeavour to assimilate the different creeds and nationalities that make up our population; and in no way do we think this can be accomplished as well as by a system of national public schools.

Now, I can easily understand that that view will meet opposition; I can easily understand that it is different from the view taken by many hon. members of this House. But I do say that there is nothing bigoted, there is nothing fanatical in it. And it is the opinion which prevails largely in the province of Ontario. There is nothing in that opinion which can possibly give of-

fence. Now, I wish to read another letter which was addressed to me. This is dated 10th February, and I would ask hon. members to bear in mind in this connection the fact that the Prime Minister did not introduce this Bill until 21st February. This correspondent says:

As you are doubtless aware, it is rumoured that it is the intention of the government to insert a clause in the constitution of the new province or provinces to be erected in the Northwest Territories of the Dominion, requiring those provinces to maintain a system of Roman Catholic separate schools. Now, I do not think it can be successfully controverted that the separate schools of this province are a hindrance to its progress; first, by reason of the inferior educational facilities they offer in comparison with our non-sectarian public schools; second, by reason of the distrust towards each other which they engender among our citizens; and, last, because of the additional expense occasioned by maintaining a dual system. If then, separate schools have retarded the progress of our own fair province, how important it must be that those new provinces destined to become the planting-out ground of a great empire, should be permitted to develop into glanhood, unshackled by the binding processes which are dwarfing their sisters, Ontario and Quebec.

A truly national policy for the west would be to make all creeds and nationalities equal before the law by maintaining only national secular schools in which only one language is taught and only one flag is recognized.

As, therefore, you were elected to represent the district of East Toronto in parliament, and I am an humble elector of that district, I respectfully urge you to oppose the enactment of such an iniquitous clause, even should you find it necessary to antagonize political friends by so doing.

I repeat that it may not be possible for every hon. gentleman in this House or for some citizens of this country to agree altogether with these sentiments; but I say that these sentiments are those cherished by a large section of the people of Ontario, people who are reasonable and sensible, and from whom this agitation comes.

The hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Grant) in discussing this question the other night, showed himself to be in an apologetic frame of mind. He felt called upon to apologize from his place in this House for the province from which he comes. He apologized to his colleagues in this House and to the people in other parts of the country especially for the city of Toronto, because of the position it has taken upon this question. Sir, I have no doubt that the people of Toronto felt very much relieved after that hon. gentleman (Mr. Grant) had made his apology. The people of that great city, I have no doubt, were downcast, they went about with their heads down and feeling very glum. But, after the hon. gentleman had made his apology on their behalf they would make up their minds that the situation was improving and that they might attend the horse show and enjoy

themselves. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Grant) in continuing thought his apology as applied to the whole of Ontario, was too general, and he gave us to understand that all the fanatical people were to be found within the limits of the city of Toronto. Now, Mr. Speaker, the population of Toronto is made up almost wholly of native Canadians, and of natives of the province of Ontario at that. Toronto is not a composite city, it is a Canadian city. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Toronto do not differ in sentiment and opinion, at any rate so far as this question is concerned, from the people of the rest of the province of Ontario. The hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Grant) tried to lead the members of this House to believe that the educational clauses in this Bill were satisfactory to the people of this province and to the people of his constituency. One hearing or reading the hon. gentleman's speech would come to the conclusion that the people of the riding of North Ontario and the people of the whole province of Ontario were crying out to have these clauses enacted in the Bill. Of course, I do not pretend that these were the hon. gentleman's words, but no other idea could be taken from his observations than the one I have given. As I have said before, it would be far better if hon. members on the other side of the House would tell their colleagues and the people generally the exact position of affairs in Ontario so far as this question is concerned. The hon. member for North Ontario went so far as to speak of the people who had sincere views on this question and who are moderate and reasonable people as a 'blatant mob.' He wanted his colleagues in this House and the people in other parts of the country to understand that when these people spoke on this subject they were like a lot of calves bellowing—for that is the meaning of his words. I repeat that it would do much better if hon. gentlemen opposite would speak out and state what is the sentiment in Ontario. Of course, anything that I might say on this point would in all probability have but little influence with hon. gentlemen opposite. But perhaps they will listen to the leading organ of the Liberal party in Ontario. What the 'Globe' says on this subject may sink deeper into their minds and hearts. On the 19th of April the 'Globe' had a leading editorial on this subject, and I propose to take up your line in reading this short article in case it may have escaped the attention of hon. members. It bears the significant caption, 'In a Fool's Paradise,' and is as follows:

Those who suppose that opposition to the educational clauses in the Northwest Autonomy Bills is confined to Toronto, and that it is dependent on Orange-Toryism for its vitality, are living in a fool's paradise. It may be that the noisiest clamour is being made by Toronto Tories and by newspapers catering for ultra-

Protestant and Tory or quasi-Tory support. But such opposition is utterly without significance, and may safely be disregarded both by the public and by parliament. And it may be, too, that public opinion on this and other questions is represented as inadequately and as uncertainly in a Toronto club as in the lobbies and smoking rooms of the House of Commons. That point need not be argued.

But the point of capital importance, and which cannot be disproved by shutting one's eyes to its undesired existence or by shouting bravely that it does not exist, is the unmistakable fact that not in Toronto alone but in scores of centres throughout this province the sanest and steadiest and most intelligent men cannot bring themselves to approve of the Dominion parliament, on any pretext whatsoever, interfering in the educational affairs of the new provinces. The men who make this objection are not Tories. They are not Orangemen. They are Liberals. They are, some of them, the men who give virility and prestige to Liberalism in their constituencies, and without whom there would be no Liberal party worthy of the name. To ignore the fact of their opposition, to minimize its significance, or to misunderstand its quality is to play the part of children in a situation which demands the wisdom and courage of men.

Another delusion is the notion that this significant opposition is wholly based upon racial or religious prejudices. There are, to be sure, race and creed fanatics here and there throughout Ontario whose occupation would be gone and whose enjoyment of life would be destroyed were they unable periodically to raise a scare about French Canadian domination or the aggression of the hierarchy. But there is no endurance in any opposition they may excite; and if the present controversy is politically abortive it will, in a large measure, be due to the revolt from the part played by the leading organs of anti-French and anti-Catholic fanaticism. The opposition that counts, however, and that will survive when the frenzy of the professional fire-eaters is past, is the deliberate and convinced opposition of the men in dominantly Protestant constituencies who have never bowed the knee to the Baal of race and creed prejudice, and who again and again defended the inalienable rights of religious minorities against unjust political antagonism. There are Protestant Liberals who fought the P. P. A. and its minions in their anti-Catholic campaign in Ontario ten years ago, who would not join the equal rights movement or withdrew from it when it was diverted to baser purposes, and who in every campaign of bigotry since confederation stood resolutely for the principle and the practice of religious tolerance and racial unity. To class those men, and men of their spirit, with the Toronto sensationalists, or to regard their opposition as either misguided or short-lived, is to comfort one's self in a fool's paradise.

Members of the Liberal party in the House of Commons would follow the counsels of prudence if, during the Easter recess, they sounded the most intelligent and most significant opinion of their leading support. The echo voice of the purblind partisan is unimportant, and members of parliament ought to guard against the soothing tones of those who would heal the hurt of the Liberal party lightly with their peace! peace! when there is no peace. A public man cannot afford to live in a fool's paradise.

I think, Sir, those words will sink deeper into the hearts and minds of hon. gentlemen opposite than the words that fell from the lips of the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Grant). I notice in a cabled press despatch to-day the opinion of another authority, an eminent Canadian statesman who has been translated to the Senate, that place which in late years have become a haven of rest for defeated Liberal candidates and for political nonentities with long purses. I notice by a telegram to the Canadian Associated Press that Senator Fulford has been putting forth some views in England with regard to this question. I do not suppose that gentleman could possibly have received a copy of the 'Globe' in which appeared the editorial of the 19th of April, which I have just read, otherwise he would not have written the letter he did to the London 'Morning Chronicle.' I do not think that gentleman has ever been in very close touch with the masses of the people of this country, or with the electorate, and I think he would have done well to wait a little while until he became better acquainted with this question before he undertook to pose as a Canadian authority before the English people.

Now I do not propose to refer at any length to the manner in which this legislation was introduced into this House. It was introduced in a most peculiar manner. I cannot understand why the Prime Minister introduced it without having the advice and assistance of the ex-Minister of the Interior and the Minister of Finance. I believe if both those gentlemen had been present the educational clauses of this Bill would have been omitted, because the position they took in 1896 upon a similar issue was exactly opposite to the position they were obliged to take in support of the present measure. But the Prime Minister may have felt that he was taking the course of least resistance, and that in forcing the Bill hurriedly into the House before these gentlemen returned he would have less resistance to overcome than he would have to meet from other quarters if he omitted these clauses from the Bill altogether. It seems to me in looking into that feature of the case that the Prime Minister was a little over confident in taking the action he did, that his recent successes at the polls had led him to go a little too far and to take up a position which he found himself unable to maintain.

Now, Sir, not having a legally trained mind, I am not able to say exactly what the ordinances of the Northwest legislature in respect to the school question mean, but it seems to me that they are liable to lead to a great many complications. We have the Finance Minister saying that by this process separate schools in the Northwest will gradually disappear; while on the other hand we have the opinion expres-

sed outside this House that they mean the introduction of the thin edge of the wedge, and will have the effect of multiplying them. Now, Sir, with all these opinions before us, would it not be infinitely better at the present time to drop out these clauses altogether? I submit that if the Minister of Finance is correct in the view he takes that separate schools will disappear altogether in a short time, and if he is supporting this measure because he believes that will be the case. I cannot understand how his supporters, especially those from the province of Quebec whose views differ from those of other members in this House, can support that measure. Therefore, are we not drifting in another direction in this case the same as we drifted in 1896? Have I not proved to this House that the people of Ontario and the people of other parts of Canada generally believed in 1896 that the present Prime Minister was in principle opposed to separate schools in Manitoba, and are we not deceiving the people in the province of Quebec by this legislation? Is this legislation which the people of Quebec want? Will we not find this question cropping up again in the federal political arena in a very short time? I think that is bound to happen, and I believe that this legislation will be the beginning of strife and discord in this country.

Now before resuming my seat I desire briefly to refer to the peculiar position occupied by the ex-Minister of the Interior, the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton). I think I cannot better characterize his attitude upon this question than by saying that he has been trying to make a wide turning movement. He resigned to prevent separate schools becoming a part of the constitution of the Northwest provinces. The Prime Minister said it was a question of words only between himself and the member for Brandon, indicating that it was not necessary for his colleague to resign, and that these clauses might have been amended so as to prevent his resignation. The ex-Minister of the Interior has told us in effect that the government were not able to draw a legal document, that they did not know the meaning of a legal document, that it was drawn by an office boy, or a draughtsman—I think the latter was the word used—that a draughtsman must have drawn the first educational clauses of this Bill. When that statement was made I did not notice any signs of humiliation upon the face of the Postmaster General, nor any very marked sign of humiliation upon the face of the Minister of Justice. If I understood correctly, the speech of the ex-minister, taken in connection with the accompanying circumstances, he himself must have drawn these amendments.

This is a great game, it seems to me. It has not been customary for the hon. Minister of Justice to sit silent when charges of that kind have been made in respect to

his work. The hon. Minister of Justice does not lack courage and it is rather a peculiar position in which we find that hon. gentleman. We see him sitting docile and calm, taking the thrusts of the hon. member for Brandon. Is it because there is any brotherly love that we do not know of, or affection, or charity existing between these hon. gentlemen? Is it out of the generosity of his heart that he is not going to pay any attention to these things? No, it is not that. It is a larger game, a bigger game. The hon. member for Brandon knew, when he made that statement in reference to the draughtsman, that it was impossible for the hon. Minister of Justice to answer him. He knew he could not answer him. The hon. Minister of Justice wants a law enacted granting the privilege that the amendment is designed to grant, the privilege of separate schools by Dominion legislation, and the hon. Minister of Justice knew that if he got up and contradicted the hon. member for Brandon in respect to the amendments being radically different from the original clauses that the Minister of Justice having a following in this House and his legal advice being respected, it would change the intention and belief of the seven members from the Northwest, and he knew that if the belief of the seven members from the Northwest in the cause of the hon. member for Brandon were shattered they would not vote for this Bill, that there would be another bolt and that might lead to a further bolt and the result was that the hon. Minister of Justice had to sit in his place and wait until every hon. member from the Northwest Territories and as many as possible from other parts of this country had committed themselves so that they would vote right. I think if I understand the temperament of the hon. Minister of Justice properly, at as late a date as possible he will get on his feet and say there is no practical difference between the amended clauses and the original clauses of this Bill. That is the view I take of the position of the hon. Minister of Justice.

I do not intend to take up any very much time in referring to the conditions in England and France in regard to education to which some reference has already been made. I do not think it has very much to do with this question, because the circumstances in both these countries are so entirely different from what they are in our own Northwest. They have no influx of different nationalities as we have and the question of how best to assimilate these different peoples and different races does not come before the people of either England or France. It is a mistake to suppose, in so far as my information goes, that the chief study in the public schools of Great Britain is the study of religious dogma. The tendency in England is towards non-sectarian, civic control. Prior to 1870 denominational schools existed in Great Britain. They were not able to stem the tide of illiteracy

and in 1870 the Forster law provided for the establishment of public and secular schools. From 1870 to 1902, forty-eight per cent of the children have been educated in these schools. The denominational schools, as they existed previous to 1870, have shrunk in number. They have fallen from 100 per cent in 1870 to 52 per cent in 1902. By a law passed in 1902 denominational schools came partly under civic control and in the denominational schools religious instruction is being brought more under civic control all the time. There seems to be a forward movement in England in respect to education.

In France what is the situation? In 1879, under Jules Ferry, who was appointed Minister of Public Instruction, a measure was adopted by which public schools were freed from all relation with the church. By a regulation of 1886 the employment in future in public schools of teachers belonging to religious orders was forbidden. At the end of 1897 there were 4,000,000 pupils going to secular schools and 1,500,000 pupils going to clerical schools. In the last few years schools maintained by religious associations have been abolished. In 25 years the national system has developed, the attendance has improved and there are better courses of study and better qualified teachers. I do not refer to this for the purpose of showing that the conditions which exist in England or in France are suitable to this country, but because of the explanation which has been made in this House by some hon. gentlemen that these conditions are different from those which I have stated.

I do not intend to take up the attention of the House any longer. The question is: How are we to Canadianize the Northwest? It is a very serious and a very pressing question. It may be in the interest of the Northwest to continue the system of separate schools which they have had and which in all likelihood would be continued, but what I contend for and what I hold is that we should leave that question to them, and that we should not start out by emphasizing by Dominion legislation the importance of dividing the children up into different camps and cliques. It may be necessary to do that, it may be in the interest of the people of the Northwest that there should be religious education, but what I say is that we should not emphasize the fact at this time taking everything into consideration by our legislation. The new provinces should be permitted to deal with this question in the way which may seem best suited to their conditions as time goes on. What are their conditions? In these Northwest Territories we have colonies of Swedes, Finns, Bohemians, Hungarians, Jews, Austrians, Germans, Russians, Icelanders, Mennonites, Galicians and Doukhobors. The question is how to assimilate these races and how to secure their co-operation in building up the nation. It requires every effort we can possibly think of to establish this

union, and I think, Mr. Speaker, in no way can this great task be better accomplished than by national public schools. This, Sir, is a provincial question. It is a provincial question in the province of Quebec notwithstanding the British North America Act. If there were not a word in the British North America Act in reference to the situation in Ontario and Quebec, the school system would be precisely the same as it is at the present time, because it is by provincial legislation that these matters are regulated and the people of Quebec, Ontario and all the other provinces know better how to regulate these matters to suit their conditions than we do in this parliament. One condition is necessary in the province of Quebec where certain conditions prevail, another system in Ontario, another system in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and perhaps another system in Manitoba or in our great Northwest which is growing and into which so many different nationalities are going. I say it is essentially a provincial question. It is a provincial question in Ontario and

Quebec, notwithstanding the fact that reference is made to it in the British North America Act. I believe that upon the seven members from the Northwest must rest the responsibility for this legislation, because if these gentlemen had insisted upon the question being left to the provinces, there is no doubt but what they would have won the day. I am sorry for the course which events have taken. I believe that if the question had been left to the provinces the government would have been less embarrassed than they are at the present time by reason of the course which they have taken. I and other hon. members have said that it is unconstitutional to interfere with this question. We are doing something that is unconstitutional. We are amending the constitution. I say in the name of peace and in the name of harmony let us drop these educational clauses out of the Bill. They are unconstitutional in any case, and let the provinces be free to act in their own best interests as time goes on.